arXiv:math/9710222v1 [math.NT] 9 Oct 1997

SEPARABILITY, MULTI-VALUED OPERATORS, AND ZEROES OF L-FUNCTIONS

DAVID GOSS

Abstract. Let $\mathbf{k}$ be a global function field in 1-variable over a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$, p prime, ∞ a fixed place of $\mathbf{k}$, and $\mathbf{A}$ the ring of functions of $\mathbf{k}$ regular outside of ∞. Let E be a Drinfeld module or T-module. Then, as in [Go1], one can construct associated characteristic p L-functions based on the classical model of abelian varieties *once* certain auxiliary choices are made. Our purpose in this paper is to show how the well-known concept of "maximal separable (over the completion $\mathbf{k}_\infty$) subfield" allows one to construct from such L-functions certain separable extensions which are independent of these choices. These fields will then depend only on the isogeny class of the original T-module or Drinfeld module and $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, and should presumably be describable in these terms. Moreover, they give a very useful framework in which to view the "Riemann hypothesis" evidence of [W1], [DV1], [Sh1]. We also establish that an element which is *separably* algebraic over $\mathbf{k}_\infty$ can be realized as a "multi-valued operator" on general T-modules. This is very similar to realizing $1/2$ as the multi-valued operator $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$ on $\mathbb{C}^*$. Simple examples show that this result is false for non-separable elements. This result may eventually allow a "two T's" interpretation of the above extensions in terms of multi-valued operators on E and certain tensor twists.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{F}_r$ be the finite field with $r = p^m$ elements and let $\mathcal{X}$ be a smooth projective geometrically connected curve over $\mathbb{F}_r$. Let $\infty \in \mathcal{X}$ be a fixed closed point and let $\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A}) := \mathcal{X} \setminus \infty$. It is well known that $\mathbf{A}$ is a Dedekind domain with a finite class group and unit group equal to ${\mathbb{F}_r}^*$. The domain $\mathbf{A}$ is also the ground ring for the theory of Drinfeld modules and T-modules — in this paper we shall loosely refer to Drinfeld modules or T-modules as "motives." To such motives one can associate characteristic p valued L-series via the familiar use of Euler factors. These concepts were discussed in detail in [Go1]; in particular, attention was given in [Go1] to some numerical evidence [W1], [DV1] (and now [Sh1]) which seems to be an indication of the correct "Riemann hypothesis" in the theory. In Section 8.24 of [Go1] a rather ad hoc exposition of the available evidence was presented.

Another major theme of [Go1] was the "two T's" which we now briefly explain. Let $\mathbf{k}$ be the fraction field of $\mathcal{X}$ (= the quotient field of $\mathbf{A}$) and let $F/\mathbf{k}$ be a finite extension. Let ψ be a Drinfeld module over F. Then via ψ the elements of $\mathbf{A}$ play *two* distinct roles in the theory: sitting inside F, they are *scalars*, while inside $\mathbf{A}$ they are *operators*. The "two T's" is just the idea that one must constantly keep these two concepts distinct. Thus one works with algebras like $\mathbf{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_r} \mathbf{A}$ where one copy of $\mathbf{A}$ represents scalars and the other represents

---

Date: Autumn, 1997.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11G09.

Key words and phrases. Drinfeld modules, T-modules, characteristic p L-series, L-zeroes, multi-valued operators.

This research was supported by NSA grant MDA 904-97-1-0048.

operators. (In the paper we will denote the copy representing scalars with non-bold symbols to avoid any confusion.)

In any case, simple as it may seem, the two T's is a very useful principle for grouping the various elements of function field arithmetic. Indeed, in the universe of T as scalar one finds exponential functions, periods, modular forms, factorials, gamma functions, etc. In the universe of T as operator one has the theory of the zeta function of Drinfeld modules and T-modules over finite field, global L-functions of Drinfeld modules or T-modules, zeta functions, etc. Indeed, it is precisely the $\mathbf{A}$-action on the motive that allows one to form characteristic polynomials of the Frobenius morphism of a T-module over a finite field and these characteristic polynomials (which live the in operator universe) are precisely the Euler factors of the associated global L-series. The two T's also seems to suggest viewing the zeroes of these L-functions as being operators of some sort on the original motive.

The reader may well wonder about an analog of the two T's in classical algebraic number theory. However, as pointed out in Remark 9.9.13 of [Go1] this is not possible simply because $\mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}$ *is* $\mathbb{Z}$. Thus complex numbers must play the two roles at the same time; a sort of "wave-particle duality" in number theory.

Now let $f(x)$ be an irreducible polynomial with coefficients in some field of finite characteristic. It has long been known that the classical methods of Galois theory, i.e., field automorphisms, work best only for those $f(x)$ where $f(x)$ is *separable.* It is the purpose of this note to begin the study of L-zeroes from the point of view of the two T's via the concept of separability. More precisely, we have two major goals in this paper. The first will be to use the concept of separability to present a general structure in which to view the above mentioned "RH"-evidence. This structure arises very simply in the following manner: in order to even define L-functions of motives (which will be recalled in Section 2) there are a couple of arbitrary choices that must be made — one must first choose a sign function, sgn, and then a positive uniformizer π in the completion of $\mathbf{k}$ at ∞. Once these two choices are made, one can "exponentiate ideals" (Definition 2) and thus define L-functions on the space $S_\infty := \mathbf{C}_\infty^* \times \mathbb{Z}_p$, where $\mathbf{C}_\infty$ is the completion of a fixed algebraic closure of $\mathbf{k}_\infty$. Thus the zeroes of our L-functions at a given $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ (which come from the first variable of $s = (x, y) \in S_\infty$) actually depend on two auxiliary parameters: sgn and π. However, by simply passing to the *maximal separable (over* $\mathbf{k}_\infty$*) subfields* of the fields generated by the zeroes for each y, we will show how we already obtain an invariant of these choices. We call this separable field $Z(L, y)$. There is then an "obvious" choice for this field which arises simply from the coefficients of the L-series; this field is called $C(L, y)$ and always lies in $Z(L, y)$. The RH-evidence seems to imply that we should expect $C(L, y) = Z(L, y)$ (but see Remarks 6 for the case of complex multiplication). In any case the fields $Z(L, y)$ depend only on the isogeny class of the original motive and $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and should somehow have a canonical description in these terms.

The reader may also wonder about the total field generated by the roots at a given $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. However, it is very easy to see that a given extension of $\mathbf{k}_\infty$ is determined by its maximal separable subfield *and* the inseparability degree. Thus the crucial work is to find $Z(L, y)$.

Our second goal is to show how the concept of separability allows one to extend the definition of the Drinfeld module or T-module to certain "multi-valued operators" as implied by the two T's (and as mentioned above). Let α be a complex number; then the operator $x \mapsto x^\alpha = e^{\alpha \log x}$ on $\mathbf{C}^*$ is well known to be multi-valued in general. By using the logarithm and exponential of a motive one can try to define multi-valued operators in characteristic p

in a very similar fashion. In fact it turns out that it is impossible in general (i.e., for arbitrary T-modules) to realize a given $\alpha \in \mathbf{C}_\infty$ as a multi-valued operator as simple examples show. However, this procedure will be shown to *always* work when α is separably algebraic over $\mathbf{k}_\infty$ (Theorem 2; see also the remark before Question 4 for the case of c.m.). It thus remains to somehow connect the two uses of separability in this paper; i.e., to canonically describe the fields $Z(L,y)$ and $C(L,y)$ etc. in terms of multi-valued operators. As of this writing, there are no obvious clues on how to do this and we pose several questions along these lines (e.g. Questions 3 and 4).

Section 2 reviews the definitions of L-series and defines the fields $Z(L,y)$, $C(L,y)$, etc., (Definitions 4 and 6). In Remarks 7 we will also show how the two T's gives a satisfactory explanation of why the characteristic p L-functions do not satisfy functional equations of the classical sort. Section 3 then discusses multi-valued operators and Drinfeld modules where the desired realization as multi-valued operators is very easy. Section 4 discusses the general theory of multi-valued operators for arbitrary T-modules. We will show that there is a very close connection between realizing elements as multi-valued operators and the theory of hyper-derivatives. Finally Section 5 discusses what little is known for the v-adic theory of L-functions of Drinfeld and T-modules, $v \in \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$. In particular we also report on some interesting computer work on certain *global* fields (i.e., finite extensions of $\mathbf{k}$) which arise in the theory.

It is my pleasure to thank the National Security Agency for its support of this work and to acknowledge very useful communication with G. Anderson, T. Satoh and D. Wan. I also thank J. Roberts for his computer work which is reported on in Section 5 and J. Zhao for pointing out a number of misprints in an earlier version of this paper.

2. Separability and zeroes of L-functions

In Section 8 of [Go1] the theory of characteristic p valued L-functions was presented, and, in particular, some evidence for a "Riemann hypothesis" for such functions was given (Section 8.24). It is the goal of this section to recast this evidence from the viewpoint of "separable subfields of zero fields" and the "two T's" which we believe is a more natural approach than the ad hoc one taken in [Go1]. In particular, we will formulate here some general problems on the zeroes of arbitrary L-functions; the solution to these problems may also explain the above mentioned evidence.

We begin by reviewing the definition of our L-series where the basic notation of rings will be exactly as in [Go1]. We let $\mathbf{A}$ be arbitrary, as in the introduction, and set $\mathbf{k}$ to be its quotient field. Set $d_\infty = \deg \infty$ where the degree is taken over $\mathbb{F}_r$ and let $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{k}_\infty$. Let $\mathbf{C}_\infty$ be the completion of a fixed algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$ of $\mathbf{K}$ equipped with its canonical metric, and let $\overline{\mathbf{k}} \subset \mathbf{C}_\infty$ be the algebraic closure of $\mathbf{k}$. Let $\mathbf{k}^{\mathrm{sep}} \subset \overline{\mathbf{k}}$ be the separable closure of $\mathbf{k}$ and let $\mathbf{K}^{\mathrm{sep}} \subset \mathbf{C}_\infty$ be the separable closure of $\mathbf{K}$. Let $\mathbb{F}_\infty \subset \mathbf{K}$ be the field of constants. A *sign function*, sgn, is a homomorphism $\operatorname{sgn}\colon \mathbf{K}^* \to \mathbb{F}_\infty^*$ which is the identity on $\mathbb{F}_\infty^*$. An element $\alpha \in \mathbf{K}^*$ is said to be *positive* or *monic* if and only if $\operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) = 1$.

Now fix a positive uniformizer $\pi \in \mathbf{K}^*$ and let α be positive. We therefore have

$$\alpha = \pi^j \langle \alpha \rangle \,,$$

where $j = v_\infty(\alpha)$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle_\pi$ depends on π and belongs to the 1-units, U_1, in $\mathbf{K}$. The element $\langle \alpha \rangle$ is called the 1-*unit part of* α *with respect to* π. Clearly $\langle \alpha\beta \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle \langle \beta \rangle$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the group of $\mathbf{A}$-fractional ideals and let $\mathcal{P}^+$ be the subgroup of principal and positively generated ideals. It is quite easy to see that the finiteness of the class group of $\mathbf{A}$ implies that $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{P}^+$ is finite. Let $\mathfrak{I} = (\mathfrak{i})$ be in $\mathcal{P}^+$ where $\mathfrak{i}$ is positive. We then naturally define $\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle := \langle \mathfrak{i} \rangle$ thus defining a homomorphism from $\mathcal{P}^+ \to U_1$.

It is well known, and easy to see, that U_1 is a topological module over the p-adic integers $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Let $\hat{U_1} \subset \mathbf{C}_\infty$ be the 1-units of $\mathbf{C}_\infty$. It is clear that $\hat{U_1}$ also contains unique p-th roots. Thus $\hat{U_1}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_p$-vector space and, consequently, is a uniquely divisible abelian group. As divisible abelian groups are injective, the homomorphism $\langle \ \rangle$ may be extended automatically to $\mathcal{I}$; as $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{P}^+$ is finite, this extension is *unique*. We will also denote this extended mapping by $\langle \ \rangle \colon \mathcal{I} \to \hat{U_1}$.

Definition 1. We set $S_\infty := \mathbf{C}_\infty^* \times \mathbb{Z}_p$.

The group S_∞ has a topology in the obvious fashion; its group operation is written additively.

The next definition presents the fundamental notion of "exponentiating an ideal."

Definition 2. Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be a non-zero fractional ideal of $\mathbf{A}$ and let $s = (x, y) \in S_\infty$. We set

$$\mathfrak{I}^s := x^{\deg \mathfrak{I}} \langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle^y \,,$$

where

$$\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle^y = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{y}{j} (\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle - 1)^j \,.$$

It is easy to check that $\mathfrak{I} \mapsto \mathfrak{I}^s$ has all the usual properties of exponentiation $n \mapsto n^s$ for n a positive integer and s a complex number. The group S_∞ is thus seen to play the role classically played by the complex numbers; that is, our L-functions are naturally defined on an open subset of S_∞.

Let $\pi_* \in \mathbf{C}_\infty$ be a fixed d_∞-th root of π. Let $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. We set

$$s_j = (\pi_*^{-j}, j) \in S_\infty \,.$$

When no confusion will result, we simply denote s_j by "j."

Proposition 1. *Let $\mathfrak{I} = (\mathfrak{i})$ be a principal ideal. Then $\mathfrak{I}^{s_j} = \mathfrak{i}^j / \operatorname{sgn}(\mathfrak{i})^j$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary 8.2.7 in [Go1]. □

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathfrak{I} = (\mathfrak{i})$ be as above where $\mathfrak{i}$ is now positive. Then $\mathfrak{I}^{s_j} = \mathfrak{i}^j$.*

Next we need to discuss how the above definitions depend on the choice of positive uniformizer. Let ${}_1\pi$ and ${}_2\pi$ be two positive uniformizers in $\mathbf{K}$. Let $u := {}_1\pi / {}_2\pi$; thus $u \in U_1$. Let $\langle ? \rangle_i$ be the 1-unit parts defined with respect to ${}_i\pi$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be a fractional ideal of $\mathbf{A}$. Then*

$$\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle_1 = \left(u^{1/d_\infty}\right)^{\deg \mathfrak{I}} \cdot \langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle_2 \,,$$

where we take the unique 1-unit root of u.

Proof. This is Proposition 8.2.15 of [Go1]. □

Remarks 1. Let α be any 1-unit in $\mathbf{K}$ and let $t \in \mathbb{Q}_p$. If $t \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, then α^t is computed by the binomial theorem exactly as in Definition 2, and clearly also lies in $\mathbf{K}$. If $t \notin \mathbb{Z}_p$ then there is certainly a power of p, say p^m, such that $t_1 := p^m t \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Thus

$$\alpha^t = (\alpha^{t_1})^{p^{-m}}$$

and is thus *totally inseparable* over $\mathbf{K}$. This applies to u^{1/d_∞} where u is given just above. It also applies to the elements $\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle$ for $\mathfrak{I}$ an ideal of $\mathbf{A}$. Indeed, if o is the order of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{P}^+$, then $\mathfrak{I}^o = (\mathfrak{i})$ where $\mathfrak{i}$ is positive; so $\langle \mathfrak{i} \rangle \in \mathbf{K}$. Further,

$$\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle = \langle \mathfrak{i} \rangle^{1/o}$$

and is thus totally inseparable over $\mathbf{K}$. The same result is now easily seen to be true for $u^{y/d_\infty} = (u^{1/d_\infty})^y$ and $\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle^y$ for any $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Now let ${}_i\pi_*$ be chosen d_∞-th roots of ${}_i\pi$, $i = 1, 2$. Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be an ideal and let $\mathfrak{I}_i^{s_1} := \mathfrak{I}^{s_1}$ be defined with respect to ${}_i\pi$, $i = 1, 2$; i.e., by using ${}_i\pi$ in the definition of $s_1 \in S_\infty$.

Proposition 3. *There exists a d_∞-th root of unity ζ which is independent of $\mathfrak{I}$, such that*

$$\mathfrak{I}_1^{s_1} = \zeta^{\deg I} \cdot \mathfrak{I}_2^{s_1}\,.$$

Proof. This is Proposition 8.2.16 of [Go1] ☐

Next we recall the definition of L-series of Drinfeld modules and T-modules. As stated in the introduction, a nonconstant element $T \in \mathbf{A}$ plays two distinct roles in the theory. In order to keep these roles distinct, it is very convenient to introduce another copy of the rings $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{k}$, $\mathbf{k}_v$ ($v \in \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$), etc. — to keep the two copies apart, we will denote the second copy by non-bold letters. So the rings A, k, k_v (v is identified with its isomorphic image in $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$), etc., will be rings of *scalars*. There is obviously a canonical isomorphism from a boldface ring to its non-bold copy; this isomorphism is denoted $\theta := \theta_{\text{con}}$. Thus the map,

$$\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\theta_{\text{con}}} A \hookrightarrow k$$

makes any extension of k automatically into an $\mathbf{A}$-field. *We will adopt this "two T's" set-up throughout this paper. Thus Drinfeld modules, etc., will be defined over non-bold rings of scalars inside C_∞ and will give rise to algebraic actions of elements in the bold rings of operators.* The reader should note that because we have adopted the two T's throughout this paper, our notation for L-series will occasionally be different than that of [Go1] (e.g., Example 1).

It is standard to denote $\theta_{\text{con}}(T)$ be θ. However, we shall also adopt the useful convention (as in [Go1]) that if $\alpha \in \mathbf{C}_\infty$ then $\overline{\alpha} := \theta(\alpha) \in C_\infty$ etc. Thus, for instance, $\theta(T) = \theta = \overline{T}$.

Now let F be a finite extension of k and let $\mathbf{F} \subset \overline{\mathbf{k}}$ be its inverse image under θ_{con}. Let ψ be a Drinfeld module of rank d defined over F. Let $\mathcal{O}_F \subset F$ be the ring of A-integers. For almost all primes $\mathfrak{P}$ of A, one can reduce ψ to a Drinfeld module $\psi^{\mathfrak{P}}$ of rank d over the finite field $\mathcal{O}_F/\mathfrak{P}$ (which is obviously still an $\mathbf{A}$-field). Thus there is a Frobenius endomorphism $F_{\mathfrak{P}}$ of $\psi^{\mathfrak{P}}$, and one sets

$$P_{\mathfrak{P}}(u) := \det(1 - uF_{\mathfrak{P}} \mid T_v(\psi^{\mathfrak{P}}))$$

where T_v is the v-adic Tate module of $\psi^{\mathfrak{P}}$ for $v \in \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$ prime to $\mathfrak{P}$. One knows from work of Drinfeld that this polynomial has coefficients in $\mathbf{A}$ (i.e., the coefficients are *operators*) which are independent of the choice of v ([Go1] 4.12.12.2), and that its roots satisfy the local "Riemann hypothesis" ([Go1] 4.12.8.5). One thus forms the L-series

$$L(\psi,s):=\prod_{\mathfrak{P}} P_{\mathfrak{P}}(N\mathfrak{P}^{-s})^{-1}$$

where the product is taken over all such $\mathfrak{P}$ as above, $s\in S_\infty$, and $N\mathfrak{P}$ is the ideal norm from $\mathcal{O}_F$ to $\mathbf{A}$. The local Riemann hypothesis implies that this product converges on a "half-plane" of S_∞ ([Go1], 8.6.9.1). Of course one would also like to also have factors at the bad primes of $\mathcal{O}_F$. As this is not important to us in this work, we refer the reader to Subsection 8.6 of [Go1] — in fact, very little is known here in general and finding the right factors is an important problem.

The analytic properties of $L(\psi,s)$ are always handled in the following fashion. One expands out the Euler product for $L(\psi,s)$ to obtain a "Dirichlet series" of the form $\sum_{\mathfrak{I}} a_{\mathfrak{I}}\mathfrak{I}^{-s}$. In turn, the sum $\sum a_{\mathfrak{I}}\mathfrak{I}^{-s}$ is rewritten as

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} x^{-j}\left(\sum_{\deg \mathfrak{I}=j} a_{\mathfrak{I}}\langle\mathfrak{I}\rangle^{-y}\right).$$

The analytic properties of $L(\psi,s)$ are then determined by the convergence properties, etc., of this 1-parameter family of power series in x^{-1}.

The procedure to define the L-series of a general T-module E with complex multiplication by $\mathbf{A}$ (or "$\mathbf{A}$-module") is clear. One reduces E at those primes where the rank of the reduction remains the same, etc. The details have, as yet, only been written down for the case $\mathbf{A}=\mathbb{F}_r[T]$ and we refer the reader to [Go1] for this. In order to get good estimates on the eigenvalues of the various Frobenius operators which is necessary for L-series, we shall always assume that our T-modules are pure in Anderson's sense (see Definition 5.5.2 of [Go1]). For instance, tensor products of Drinfeld modules are pure and the tensor product of two pure T-modules is also pure, etc.

It is also clear, in analogy with classical theory, that the L-series of a motive (i.e, a Drinfeld module or $\mathbf{A}$-module) defined over a field F depends only on the isogeny class of the motive over F.

One can more generally define L-series in the context of strictly compatible families of v-adic representations of the Galois group F^{sep} over F (where $F^{\mathrm{sep}}\subset C_\infty$ is the separable closure) in the standard fashion of elliptic curves, etc., ([Go1] Definition 8.6.7). The simplest such compatible family is obviously the trivial 1-dimensional character and the L-function of this family is denoted $\zeta_{\mathcal{O}_F}(s)$. The L-series that are defined in this fashion are said to be "of arithmetic interest."

Example 1. When $F=k$, we obtain the zeta function $\zeta_A(s)$ of $\mathbf{A}$. Thus, by definition,

$$\zeta_A(s)=\prod_{\mathfrak{P}\in\,\mathrm{Spec}(A)}(1-\mathfrak{P}^{-s})^{-1}=\sum_{\mathfrak{I}} I^{-s},$$

where $\mathfrak{I}$ runs over the ideals of A and where we have identified isomorphic (under θ) ideals in A and $\mathbf{A}$. When $\mathbf{A}=\mathbb{F}_r[T]$, then

$$\zeta_A(s)=\sum_{n\ \text{monic}} n^{-s}.$$

(Note that in [Go1], these functions were denoted $\zeta_{\mathbf{A}}(s)$ etc. To be consistent with the two T's we have dropped the bold-face in the definition...)

Remarks 2. 1. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{F}_r[T]$ and let C be the Carlitz module over F. Anderson's result on tensor product representations (see, e.g. 5.7.3 of [Go1]) implies that for $n > 0$

$$L(C^{\otimes n}, s) = \zeta_{\mathcal{O}_F}(s-n)\,.$$

Thus, even in this case, one can not just study zeta-functions in the context of Drinfeld modules alone, but *must* pass to the category of general T-modules.
2. More generally, the same arguments imply that for any motive M over $\mathbb{F}_r[T]$ we have

$$L(M \otimes C^{\otimes n}, s) = L(M, s-n)\,.$$

3. On the other hand, let $\mathbf{A}$ be arbitrary. Let ψ be a sign normalized rank one Drinfeld module (or "Hayes-module") for $\mathbf{A}$; these are the natural generalization of the Carlitz module. Then ψ is defined only over the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}^+$ of the Hayes normalizing field $H^+ \subset C_\infty$ of k. In particular H^+ is a certain finite extension of the Hilbert class field H of k which is totally split at infinity. As such, ψ will be defined over k only when $\mathbf{A}$ is a principal ideal domain. Therefore, Part 1 generalizes to $L(\psi, s)$ *only* for those fields F with $H^+ \subseteq F$. In general, one can view $\zeta_A(s)$ as being associated to the finite *set* of absolute isomorphism classes of Hayes-modules (see, e.g., §8.19 of [Go1]).

The reader should be aware that, by construction, all of the above functions $L(s)$ will have the following basic property: there exists a fixed finite extension $\mathbf{K}_1$ of $\mathbf{K}$ (depending on $L(s)$ of course) such that for every $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, the coefficients of the power series $L(x, y)$ will lie in $\mathbf{K}_1$. Let $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Then standard results in non-Archimedean function theory now imply that the zeroes (in x) of $L(x, y)$ belong to the algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$ of $\mathbf{K}$ inside $\mathbf{C}_\infty$. This simple observation is crucial in all of what follows.

Definition 3. The smallest extension of $\mathbf{K}$ containing the zeroes of $L(x, y)$ is called *the zero field of* $L(s)$ *at* y. If for a given $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ the function $L(x, y)$ is a non-zero constant, then we define $Z(L, y) = \mathbf{K}$. As the zero field of $L(s)$ possibly depends on the sign function and π as well as y, we denote it $Z(\text{sgn}, \pi, L, y)$.

It is expected that all the above L-functions will eventually be shown to be "essentially algebraic entire functions" (Definition 8.5.12 of [Go1]). This means in practice that the 1-parameter family of power series associated to the L-function, as described above, will have zeroes in x^{-1} that "flow continuously;" this can be shown for $\zeta_{\mathcal{O}_F}(s)$ (see Theorem 8.9.2 of [Go1]). It is also known for certain L-series of Drinfeld modules when $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{F}_r[T]$, see [TW1].

As the zero fields may depend on the sign function, π and $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, it is important to know how the zeroes depend on such choices. In fact, we will show in Theorem 1 that the *maximal separable subfields* of the zero fields are independent of both sgn and π. Let $L(s)$, $s \in S_\infty$, be a fixed L-series of arithmetic interest as above. To begin with, let ${}_i\pi$, $i = 1, 2$, be two choices of positive parameters in $\mathbf{K}$ for the *same* sign function sgn, and let $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Let $\{{}_i\lambda_t^{(y)}\}$, $i = 1, 2$, be the set of zeroes of $L(x, y)$ as a function in x, where the superscript "(y)" just denotes the dependence on y. One sees from Proposition 2 that to pass from $\{{}_1\lambda_t^{(y)}\}$ to $\{{}_2\lambda_t^{(y)}\}$ one just multiplies by $(u^{1/d_\infty})^y$. Let ${}_i\mathbf{K}_y$, $i = 1, 2$, be the extension of $\mathbf{K}$ generated by $\{{}_i\lambda_t^{(y)}\}$; that is ${}_i\mathbf{K}_y = Z(\text{sgn}, {}_i\pi, L, y)$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\{a_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots n$, be a finite number of elements inside a fixed algebraic closure $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ of a field $\mathcal{F}$ of characteristic p. Let $\{u_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, be a collection of totally inseparable (over $\mathcal{F}$) elements in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$. Then the maximal separable subfields of $\mathcal{F}(\{a_i\})$ and $\mathcal{F}(\{a_i u_i\})$ are equal.*

Proof. Let $t > 0$ be chosen so that $u_i^{p^t} \in \mathcal{F}$ for all i. By the multiplicativity of the inseparability degree over towers of extensions, it is easy to see that the maximal separable subfield of $\mathcal{F}(\{a_i u_i\})$ is the same as that of $\mathcal{F}(\{a_i^{p^t} \cdot u_i^{p^t}\})$. As $u_i^{p^t} \in \mathcal{F}$, this last field equals $\mathcal{F}(\{a_i^{p^t}\})$. However, the same reasoning as above shows that the maximal separable subfield of $\mathcal{F}(\{a_i^{p^t}\})$ is the same as that of $\mathcal{F}(\{a_i\})$ which completes the proof. ☐

The reader will easily see how to generalize Lemma 1 to arbitrary collections of elements.

Proposition 4. *The maximal separable subfields (over $\mathbf{K}$) of ${}_i\mathbf{K}_y$, $i = 1, 2$ are equal.*

Proof. From Remarks 1 we see that u^{1/d_∞} is totally inseparable over $\mathbf{K}$. The result thus follows from Lemma 1 and the remarks made just before Lemma 1. ☐

Remarks 3. Let p^e be the exact power of p dividing d_∞. Let $y \in p^e\mathbb{Z}_p$. Then Proposition 2 immediately shows that the fields ${}_i\mathbf{K}_y$, $i = 1, 2$ are equal. In other words, there is always a non-trivial open subset of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ where the fields generated by the roots are independent of the choice of positive π.

Next we establish that the maximal separable subfield at y of the root fields is actually independent of the choice of sign function. Let sgn_1 and sgn_2 be two sign functions. Let $a \in \mathbf{A}$ and let ${}_1\pi$ be a uniformizer which is positive for sgn_1 (i.e., $\text{sgn}_1({}_1\pi) = 1$). Thus we can write

$$a = \text{sgn}_1(a)({}_1\pi)^d u_a\,,$$

where $u_a \in U_1$. Now let $\zeta = \text{sgn}_2({}_1\pi)$. Thus

$$a = \text{sgn}_1(a)\zeta^d \cdot (\zeta^{-1} \cdot {}_1\pi)^d \cdot u_a$$

where ${}_2\pi := \zeta^{-1} \cdot {}_1\pi$ is now a positive uniformizer for sgn_2.

Proposition 5. *Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be a fractional ideal of $\mathbf{A}$. Then $\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle$ is independent of the choice of ${}_1\pi$ or ${}_2\pi$ as positive uniformizer.*

Proof. Let $\langle \mathfrak{I} \rangle_i$, $i = 1, 2$, be defined with respect to ${}_i\pi$, $i = 1, 2$. Now by definition $\langle (a) \rangle_i^{r^{d_\infty}-1} = u_a^{r^{d_\infty}-1}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus by the unique divisibility of the 1-units, we conclude that $\langle (a) \rangle_1 = \langle (a) \rangle_2 = u_a$. The result now follows by the unique divisibility of the 1-units and the finiteness of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{P}^+$. ☐

We summarize the above results in the following statement.

Theorem 1. *Let $L(s)$ be an L-series of arithmetic interest. Let $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ be fixed and let $\mathbf{K}_y$ be the extension of $\mathbf{K}$ generated by the zeroes in x of $L(x, y)$. Then the maximal separable subfield of $\mathbf{K}_y$ is independent of the choice of sign function and positive uniformizer.*

Proof. This is Propositions 4 and 5. ☐

Definition 4. Let $L(s)$ be an L-series of arithmetic interest.
1. We denote the common maximal separable subfield of $\mathbf{K}_y = Z(\text{sgn}, \pi, L, y)$ by $Z(L, y)$. This field *only* depends on $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ by Theorem 1.
2. We define

$$Z_-(L) := \bigcap_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_p} Z(L, y)$$

and

$$Z_+(L) := \prod_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_p} Z(L, y)$$

where product means the compositum. Both of these fields are obviously independent of $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Remarks 4. Let $\mathbf{K}_1$ be a finite extension of $\mathbf{K}$; so $\mathbf{K}_1$ is also clearly a local field. By taking roots of a uniformizer, it is easy to see that any totally inseparable extension of $\mathbf{K}_1$ is uniquely determined by its degree. If $\mathbf{K}_1$ is assumed to be separable over $\mathbf{K}$, then one can let $\mathbf{K}_1$ have infinite degree also. In particular, to find $Z(\text{sgn}, \pi, L, y)$ from $Z(L, y)$ one needs only know the degree of inseparability. As this degree may depend on sgn and π we denote it $i(\text{sgn}, \pi, L, y)$. Thus the *essential* part of $Z(\text{sgn}, \pi, L, y)$ is *precisely* $Z(L, y)$.

A complete theory of such L-functions would also give a formula for $i(\text{sgn}, \pi, L, y)$.

Now let $L(s)$ be the L-series of a Drinfeld module or general $\mathbf{A}$-module. Thus we see that $Z(L, y)$ depends *only* on the isogeny class of the Drinfeld module or $\mathbf{A}$-module and $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Question 1. 1. Is it possible to give a canonical description of $Z(L, y)$ only in terms of y and the isogeny class of the underlying motive?
2. Is it possible to give a canonical description of the fields $Z_\pm(L)$ only in terms of the isogeny class of the underlying motive?

We note that, as of this writing, there seem to be two obvious choices for $Z(L, y)$. The first is the "maximal" choice of the separable closure $\mathbf{K}^{\text{sep}}$ of $\mathbf{K}$ inside $\mathbf{C}_\infty$. Now the work of Wan, Thakur, Diaz-Vargas, and Sheats, [W1] [DV1] [Sh1], shows that the maximal choice is not always correct. The second choice is the "minimal" choice which we now define.

To begin with, let $\mathcal{F}$ be any local non-Archimedean field and let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be a finite extension of $\mathcal{F}$. Let $f(x) \in \mathcal{F}_1[[x]]$ be an entire power series with $f(0) = 1$. Let $\{\lambda_t\}$ be the collection of zeroes of $f(x)$ in some fixed algebraic closure of $\mathcal{F}$ containing $\mathcal{F}_1$. Let $\mathcal{F}_2$ be the extension of $\mathcal{F}$ obtained by adjoining to $\mathcal{F}$ the coefficients of $f(x)$, and let $\mathcal{F}_3$ be the extension of $\mathcal{F}$ obtained by adjoining the roots of $f(x)$.

Proposition 6. *We have* $\mathcal{F}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_3$.

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that there exists zeroes of $f(x)$ of absolute value t. Let $f_t(x) = \prod_\lambda (1 - x/\lambda)$ where we take the product of over all λ of absolute value t *with* multiplicity. General theory tells us that $f_t(x)$ is a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathcal{F}_1$. Let $\mathcal{F}_4 \subset \mathcal{F}_1$ be the extension of $\mathcal{F}$ obtained by adjoining all the coefficients of all such $f_t(x)$. Note that also $\mathcal{F}_4 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_3$ by definition. Now as $\mathcal{F}_1$ is a finite dimensional extension of $\mathcal{F}$ we also see that $\mathcal{F}_4 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1$ is a finite dimensional extension of $\mathcal{F}$; thus it is automatically complete. General theory implies that

$$f(x) = \prod_t f_t(x)\,,$$

and so the coefficients of $f(x)$ are contained in $\mathcal{F}_4$ by completeness. As $\mathcal{F}_4 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_3$, this completes the proof. $\square$

Now let $L(s)$ be our fixed L-series as above. By definition, $L(s)$ will be given as an Euler product over Euler factors of the form

$$P_{\mathfrak{P}}(N\mathfrak{P}^{-s}) = P_{\mathfrak{P}}(x^{-\deg N\mathfrak{P}}\langle N\mathfrak{P}\rangle^{-y})\,.$$

Upon expanding out the Euler product, as above, we can write

$$L(s) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} x^{-j}\left(\sum_{\deg N\mathfrak{I}=j} a_{\mathfrak{I}}\langle N\mathfrak{I}\rangle^{-y}\right)\,,$$

where $\mathfrak{I}$ runs over the ideals of the $\mathbf{A}$-integers of the base field F.

Definition 5. We define $C(\mathrm{sgn},\pi,L,y)$, to be the extension of $\mathbf{K}$ obtained by adjoining all coefficients

$$\left\{\sum_{\deg N\mathfrak{I}=j} a_{\mathfrak{I}}\langle N\mathfrak{I}\rangle^{-y}\right\}_{j=0}^{\infty}\,.$$

Proposition 7. *The maximal separable (over* $\mathbf{K}$*) subfield of* $C(\mathrm{sgn},\pi,L,y)$ *is independent of the choice of* sgn *and* π.

Proof. This follows from Remarks 1 and Lemma 1 exactly as in Proposition 4. $\square$

Remarks 5. Note that the proof of Lemma 1 *also* establishes that the maximal separable subfield of $C(\mathrm{sgn},\pi,L,y)$ is contained in the maximal separable subfield of $\mathbf{K}(\{a_{\mathfrak{I}}\})$. Example 4 given below shows that this containment may be strict.

Definition 6. 1. We denote the common maximal separable subfield of $C(\mathrm{sgn},\pi,L,y)$ by $C(L,y)$.
2. We set

$$C(L) := \bigcap_y C(L,y)\,.$$

Since $C(L,y)$ is obviously also independent of any choice of sign function or uniformizer, we see that this is also true of $C(L)$.

Proposition 6 now immediately implies the next result.

Corollary 2. *The field* $C(L,y)$ *is contained in* $Z(L,y)$ *for all* $y\in\mathbb{Z}_p$. *Thus* $C(L)\subseteq Z_-(L)\subseteq Z_+(L)$.

The field $C(L,y)$ is thus the *minimal* choice for the fields $Z(L,y)$ and $C(L)$ is the minimal choice for $Z_\pm(L)$. It is therefore natural to suspect that $C(L,y)=Z(L,y)$ and $C(L)=Z_\pm(L)$. However, as in [Go1] Section 8.24 one knows that this cannot always be true and depends on whether the Galois representations that are used to define the L-series are irreducible or not when induced to $\mathrm{Gal}(k^{\mathrm{sep}}/k)$ (if these induced representations remain irreducible then we call the original motive "absolutely irreducible" or "absolutely simple"). The problem is that if the representation is not irreducible the L-series may factor say into $L(s)=L_1(s)L_2(s)$ where e.g., $C(L_1,y)$ may be strictly larger than the original

$C(L,y)$ (see the examples below). Such a factorization commonly arises from those motives with "complex multiplication" by some order in a sufficiently large finite extension of $\mathbf{k}$.

Thus for the moment, let us assume that our absolutely simple motive has no complex multiplication implying that $C(L,y)=\mathbf{K}$. Then based on the evidence available at the moment, as mentioned in the introduction, the "Riemann hypothesis" in the context of our L-series *may* turn out to be the statement that for such irreducible representations $Z(L,y)=C(L,y)=\mathbf{K}$ for all $y\in\mathbb{Z}_p$. Indeed, the results of [W1], [DV1] and [Sh1] establish that the zeroes of $\zeta_{\mathbb{F}_r[\theta]}(s)$ are both *simple* and in $\mathbf{K}$ for *any* y. However, even here there is not yet enough evidence of both a computational and a theoretic nature to know for certain. For instance, it may turn out that the zeroes are always in a fixed finite extension of $\mathbf{K}$ (in which case one would like to predict *which* extension this is or at least bound its degree and discriminant etc.). Future research may perhaps settle this point. See Remarks 6 for motives with c.m.

Example 2. Let $\mathbf{A}=\mathbb{F}_r[T]$, $\mathbf{k}=\mathbb{F}_r(T)$ $k=\mathbb{F}_r(\theta)$ etc. Let ψ be a Drinfeld module over k with *no* complex multiplications over $\bar{k}$. Let $L(s)=L(\psi,s)$. Then R. Pink [P1] establishes that the v-adic Tate representations of $\mathrm{Gal}(k^{\mathrm{sep}}/k)$ have *open* image. As such they are certainly irreducible. As the coefficients of the characteristic polynomials are all in $\mathbf{A}$, one sees immediately that $C(L,y)=\mathbf{K}$ for all y (so that $C(L)=\mathbf{K}$ also). It is now not obviously unreasonable to expect that $C(L,y)=Z(L,y)=\mathbf{K}$ for all y.

When the L-series of the motive factors there are still some subtleties that must be kept in mind. This will be illustrated by the following examples (still with $\mathbf{A}=\mathbb{F}_r[T]$ etc.) of complex multiplication. Let F be a finite extension of k with ψ a Drinfeld module of rank 2 defined over F. We suppose further that ψ has complex multiplication over F by a separable quadratic extension $\mathbf{k}_1$ of $\mathbf{k}$ with only *one* prime of $\mathbf{k}_1$ lying above ∞ — we also denote this prime of $\mathbf{k}_1$ by ∞. Let $\mathbf{K}_1$ be the completion of $\mathbf{k}_1$ at ∞; thus $[\mathbf{K}_1\colon\mathbf{K}]=2$. Let $L(\psi,s)$ be the L-series of ψ over F. As is classically true, there is a factorization $L(\psi,s)=L(\rho_1,s)L(\rho_2,s)$ into a product of L-series of Hecke characters. Let $L_1(s)$ be $L(\rho,s)$ where ρ is either ρ_1 or ρ_2. Clearly $C(L,y)=C(L)=\mathbf{K}\subseteq C(L_1,y)\subseteq Z(L,y)$ for all $y\in\mathbb{Z}_p$. One now needs to compute $C(L_1,y)$ for such y. One expects that $C(L_1,y)$ will equal $\mathbf{K}_1$. However, this is not always true as our first example (Example 3) shows.

Example 3. Let $F:=\mathbb{F}_{r^2}(\theta)$, $A_1:=\mathbb{F}_{r^2}[\theta]$, $\mathbf{A}_1:=\mathbb{F}_{r^2}[T]$ etc. Let ψ be the Carlitz module for $\mathbf{A}_1$ over F given by

$$T\mapsto\theta\tau_1^0+\tau_1$$

where τ_1 is the r^2-power mapping. Of course ψ is the rank 2 Drinfeld module for $\mathbf{A}$ with complex multiplication by $\mathbf{A}_1$. The Hecke character ρ for ψ is the mapping which takes $(\overline{f})$ where $\overline{f}\in A_1$ is a monic prime to $f:=\theta^{-1}(\overline{f})$. Thus

$$L(\rho,s)=\prod_{\overline{f}}(1-fN(\overline{f})^{-s})^{-1}=\sum_{\substack{\overline{g}\in A_1\\ \overline{g}\text{ monic}}}gN(\overline{g})^{-s}\,.$$

Let σ be the non-trivial automorphism of $\mathbf{A}_1/\mathbf{A}$ — we use the same notation for the non-trivial automorphism of A_1/A. Then the above sum can be written

$$\sum_{\substack{\overline{g}\in A\\ \overline{g}\text{ monic}}}gN(\overline{g})^{-s}+\sum_{\substack{\{\overline{g},\overline{g}^\sigma\}\subset A_1-A\\ \overline{g}\text{ monic}}}(g+g^\sigma)N(\overline{g})^{-s}\,.$$

Thus in this case $C(L_1, y) = \mathbf{K}$ for all y.

On the other hand, the following example (Example 4) gives an example where $C(L_1, y) = \mathbf{K}_1$ for some $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Example 4. Let $r = 3$, and let $\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{A}[\lambda]$ where λ satisfies $\lambda^2 = -T$. Let ψ be the Carlitz module over $A[\overline{\lambda}] = \mathbb{F}_r[\overline{\lambda}]$ given by $\psi_\lambda = \overline{\lambda}\tau^0 + \tau$ where τ is the r-th power mapping. Thus ψ is a rank 2 Drinfeld module for $\mathbf{A}$ defined over $F = k(\overline{\lambda}) = \mathbb{F}_r(\overline{\lambda})$ given by

$$\psi_T = \theta\tau^0 + (\overline{\lambda}^3 + \overline{\lambda})\tau + \tau^2 = \theta\tau^0 + \overline{\lambda}(1-\theta)\tau + \tau^2 \,.$$

Obviously ψ has complex multiplication by $\mathbf{A}_1$. The associated Hecke character and L-series are just as in Example 3. Note however that the non-trivial automorphism of $\mathbf{A}_1/\mathbf{A}$ does not take monics to monics. Looking at monics of degree 1 in $\mathbf{A}_1$ one immediately has that for $y \neq 0$ we have $C(L_1, y) = \mathbf{K}_1$. (It is also very easy to see that $L(\rho, (x, 0)) \equiv 1$. Thus $C(L_1, 0) = \mathbf{K}$ while there are obviously no zeroes at $y = 0$ and, by definition $Z(L_1, 0) = \mathbf{K}$.)

Remarks 6. The examples just presented are instances of motives with complex multiplication. We will present here a variant of the above "Riemann hypothesis" that may be more appropriate in the complex multiplication case. (See e.g. [Ta1] for the background on the classical theory — the characteristic p case is modeled on this.) Let $\mathbf{F}$ be the complex multiplication field of an absolutely simple motive E over $\overline{\mathbf{k}} \subset \overline{\mathbf{K}}$; thus $\mathbf{F}$ is realized as algebraic endomorphisms of the isogeny class of E extending the canonical $\mathbf{k}$-action. We will consider the c.m. field $\mathbf{F}$ embedded in $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$. Moreover *once* such an embedding is given we also require that if $f \in \mathbf{F}$ and $E_{f,*}$ is its tangent action on Lie(E) then

$$E_{f,*} = \overline{f} \cdot \mathbf{1} + N_f$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity and N_f is nilpotent. This is just the obvious generalization of the definition of a T-module (e.g., Definition 5.4.5 of [Go1]).

Now let $L(s) = L(E, s)$. Note that the coefficients $\{a_{\mathfrak{I}}\}$ of $L(s)$ are contained in $\mathbf{F}$ (as we saw in the above examples). Note also that *all the arguments given above in terms of* $\mathbf{K}$ *immediately work for* $\mathbf{K}_1 := \mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{F})$. Thus, for instance, the maximal separable subfield of the extension of $\mathbf{K}_1$ generated by the zeroes of $L(x, y)$, for fixed y, is independent of the sign function and positive uniformizer etc. Note further that, by Remarks 5, the fields $C(L, y)$ are all contained in the maximal separable subfield of $\mathbf{K}_1$. As $\mathbf{K}_1$ obviously does not depend on y, it *may* ultimately be true that for absolutely simple motives with c.m., the "correct" Riemann hypothesis is the statement that for fixed y the maximal separable subfield, *over* $\mathbf{K}_1$, of the extension of $\mathbf{K}_1$ generated by the zeroes of $L(x, y)$ is precisely $\mathbf{K}_1$. Again, only future research will determine the truth of this statement. See also Question 4 in Section 4.

Remarks 7. The principle of the two T's gives an explanation of why there is no classical style functional equation for the L-functions defined here. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{F}_r[T]$ etc. and let C be the Carlitz module with exponential function $e(z)$ where $z \in C_\infty$. Note that, *because we are using the two T's set-up*, $e(z) \in k[[z]]$. Let $\xi \in C_\infty$ be the period of the Carlitz module so that the lattice of the Carlitz module is $A \cdot \xi = \mathbf{A}_*(\xi)$. Let $\Pi(i) \in A$ be the Carlitz factorial. The *Bernoulli-Carlitz numbers* BC_i are defined by

$$\frac{z}{e(z)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{BC_i}{\Pi(i)} z^i \,.$$

Thus $\{BC_i\} \subseteq k$. Because we are using the two T's we see that the definition of BC_i given here is precisely θ applied to the definition given on page 354 of [Go1].

Let i be a positive integer which is divisible by $r-1$. Note that from Definition 1 we see that

$$\zeta_A(i) := \zeta_A(s_i) \in \mathbf{K}\,.$$

Thus, from the point of view of the two T's, the "correct" formulation of Carlitz's "Euler" result is

$$\zeta_A(i)_* = \xi^i \frac{BC_i}{\Pi(i)}\,;$$

that is, the *tangent action at the origin of the multi-valued operator* $\zeta_A(i)$ *is precisely scalar multiplication by* $\xi^i \frac{BC_i}{\Pi(i)}$. Equivalently,

$$\zeta_A(i) = \xi^i \frac{BC_i}{\Pi(i)} \cdot \tau^0 + \{\text{higher terms in } \tau\}\,.$$

Now, on the other hand, standard results (8.8.1.1 of [Go1]) immediately imply that $\zeta_A(-i) \in \mathbf{A}$. Thus, it is a-priori *impossible* to match up $\zeta_A(-i)$ and BC_i etc., in the classical style as one is an operator and one is just a scalar!

Question 2. Is it possible to give a formula which generalizes the one of Carlitz just given to the higher terms of the expansion of $\zeta_A(i)$ at the origin?

Other uses of zeta values at positive integers (see [AT1] for instance) further illustrate that one really uses $\zeta_A(i)_*$ as opposed to the full zeta value. On the other hand, the theory of Drinfeld modules over finite fields and their zeta functions (§4.12 of [Go1]) lies squarely in the universe of T as operator. Indeed, the Frobenius is obviously an operator on the Drinfeld module and one is interested precisely in the extension of $\mathbf{k}$ generated by it. Moreover, Gekeler's Z-function (Definition 4.12.24 of [Go1]) computes the Euler-Poincaré characteristics $\chi(\mathbb{F}_{q^n})$ of the Drinfeld module over the finite fields $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}$, and $\chi(\mathbb{F}_{q^n})$ is a principal ideal in $\mathbf{A}$ etc.

3. Multi-valued operators and Drinfeld modules

Now that we have explained the importance of separability in terms of zeroes of L-series, our goal is to explain its importance in terms of formal modules and multi-valued operators. In particular we shall eventually explain how for general motives it is only possible to extend the formal module to separable elements; this will be our next section. In this section we briefly discuss the theory for Drinfeld modules where the result is actually trivial.

Let $\mathbf{A}$, etc., be general and let K_1 be a finite extension of K. Let ψ be a Drinfeld module defined over K_1. Thus if $K_1\{\tau\}$ is the K_1-vector space of polynomials in $\tau =$ the r-th power mapping, then $K_1\{\tau\}$ becomes an $\mathbb{F}_r$-algebra under composition and $\psi\colon \mathbf{A} \to K_1\{\tau\}$ is an injection. Let $e(\tau) := e_\psi(\tau)$, $\log(\tau) := \log_\psi(\tau)$ be the exponential and logarithm of ψ as entire $\mathbb{F}_r$-additive functions over K_1.

Definition 7. A formal power series $f(\tau)$ of the form $f(\tau) = f_\lambda(\tau) = e(\lambda \log(\tau))$, $\lambda \in C_\infty$, is said to be a *multi-valued operator* on ψ.

Note that the multi-valued operators clearly form an $\mathbb{F}_r$-subalgebra of the algebra of all formal power-series in τ. A multi-valued operator is easily seen to be at most as multi-valued as the logarithm is; e.g., if λ actually is an element of $\mathbf{A}$ then, of course, $f_{\overline{\lambda}}(\tau) = \psi_\lambda(\tau)$ is an operator on $\mathbb{G}_a$. As mentioned in the introduction, one may view a multi-valued operator as being an operator on *all* of E in exactly the same manner $x^s = e^{s\log(x)}$ is a multi-valued function on $\mathbb{C}^*$ for any $s \in \mathbb{C}$.

We then have the following simple result.

Proposition 8. *The injection $\mathbf{A} \to L\{\tau\}$, $a \mapsto \psi_a$, extends to an isomorphism of $\mathbf{C}_\infty$ with the algebra of multi-valued operators on ψ.*

Proof. By definition, for $a \in \mathbf{A}$ we have

$$\psi_a(\tau) = e(\overline{a}\log(\tau))\,. \tag{1}$$

As there is no obstruction to replacing a with an arbitrary element in $\mathbf{C}_\infty$, the result follows. □

Obviously, the above extension of the $\mathbf{A}$-action to $\mathbf{C}_\infty$ is equivalent to extending ψ to a formal $\mathbf{C}_\infty$-module.

4. SEPARABILITY, MULTI-VALUED OPERATORS AND GENERAL T-MODULES

We now discuss the applications of separability to arbitrary motives. Due to the lack of a worked out theory of uniformizability of motives for general $\mathbf{A}$, we restrict ourselves to $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{F}_r[T]$ etc. However, it is clear that once this theory is worked out, the arguments given here will immediately apply in general. We begin this section by showing that Proposition 8 is profoundly misleading in general.

Example 5. Let $E = C^{\otimes 2}$ be the second tensor power of the Carlitz module. For each $a \in \mathbf{A}$ we let $C_a^{\otimes 2}$ be the associated $\mathbb{F}_r$-linear algebraic endomorphism of $\mathbb{G}_a^2$ and we let $C_{a,*}^{\otimes 2}$ be the associated action on the tangent space at the origin. Thus, for $a = T$ one has

$$C_{T,*}^{\otimes 2} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta & 1 \\ 0 & \theta \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

Now if it were possible in general to extend $C_a^{\otimes 2}$ to *all* $a \in \mathbf{C}_\infty$ then $C_{T^{1/2},*}^{\otimes 2}$ would be a solution to the matrix equation $x^2 = C_{T,*}^{\otimes 2}$ where $C_{T,*}^{\otimes 2}$ is given as in Equation 2. However, it is easy to see that this equation is inconsistent for $p = 2$.

The reader will easily see how to construct other such examples. Indeed, let N be a nilpotent matrix. Then, of course, if $x = x \cdot \mathbf{1}$ is the scalar matrix, one has

$$(x+N)^{p^t} = x^{p^t} + N^{p^t}\,.$$

Thus for $t \gg 0$, $(x+N)^{p^t}$ is also a scalar matrix and from this other examples are readily found.

Now let E be an arbitrary uniformizable T-module defined over C_∞ and where the underlying algebraic group is isomorphic to $\mathbb{G}_a^t$ (i.e., E has "dimension t"). We note that Anderson's theory implies that *any* tensor product of Drinfeld modules is automatically uniformizable. Let $e(\mathbf{z}) := e_E(\mathbf{z})$ and $\log(\mathbf{z}) := \log_E(\mathbf{z})$ be the exponential and logarithm of E with respect to some coordinate system on the underlying algebraic group; thus $\mathbf{z}$ is a vector (and so that uniformizability is exactly equivalent to $e(\mathbf{z})$ being surjective). Let $\tau = \tau(\mathbf{z})$ be the mapping that raises each coefficient of $\mathbf{z}$ to the r-th power. As the exponential and logarithm functions are $\mathbb{F}_r$-linear, they can be written as power series in τ which we denote by $e(\tau)$, $\log(\tau)$ etc. More precisely each of these two functions may be written as $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i\tau^i$

were the c_i are $t \times t$ matrices with coefficients in the smallest extension of $k \subset C_\infty$ which contains the coefficients of the T-action.

Definition 8. Let $f(\tau)$ be any power series in τ of the form $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \tau^i$ where the a_i are $t \times t$ matrices with C_∞-coefficients. We say that $f(\tau)$ is a *multi-valued operator on E* if and only if it may be written in the form $f(\tau) = e(M \log(\tau))$ where M is a $t \times t$ matrix with C_∞-coefficients.

Definition 8 is the obvious generalization of Definition 7. Moreover, it is clear that such multi-valued operators form a sub-algebra of the algebra of all formal power series in τ and that this algebra is isomorphic to the $\mathbb{F}_r$-algebra of $t \times t$ matrices over C_∞.

It is our goal in this subsection to show that, in spite of Example 5, the T-action on E still has a vast extension to the realm of multi-valued operators. More precisely we will show the following result.

Theorem 2. *The T-action of E can be uniquely extended to an injection of $\mathbb{F}_r$-algebras, $\lambda \mapsto E_\lambda$, of $\mathbf{K}^{\text{sep}}$ into the algebra of multi-valued operators. Moreover, if $E_{\lambda,*}$ is the induced action on the tangent space at the origin, then*

$$E_{\lambda,*} = \overline{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{1} + N_\lambda = \overline{\lambda} + N_\lambda$$

where N_λ is nilpotent.

As in Proposition 8, through the use of the exponential and logarithm of E it is clear that the result will be proved if we can establish that the tangent action

$$E_{T,*} = \theta \cdot \mathbf{1} + N_T = \theta + N_T$$

of E_T uniquely extends to an injection $E_{x,*}$ of $\mathbf{K}^{\text{sep}}$ into the $\mathbb{F}_r$-algebra of $t \times t$ matrices with coefficients in C_∞ with the required form. That is, we may work “infinitesimally” with nilpotent matrices.

Theorem 2 will follow immediately from our next two propositions. Let us set $\epsilon := N_T$ where N_T is the nilpotent in $E_{T,*}$.

Proposition 9. *The T action on E extends uniquely to an injection of $\mathbf{K}$ into the algebra of multi-valued operators such that if $x \in \mathbf{K}$, then $E_{x,*} = \overline{x} + N_x$ and N_x is a polynomial in ϵ.*

Proof. The last part is clear for all $a \in \mathbf{A}$. Now let us examine what happens for $a = 1/T$. As $E_{T,*} = \theta \cdot \mathbf{1} + \epsilon = \theta + \epsilon$, we are led to define

$$E_{1/T,*} := (\theta + \epsilon)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon/\theta} = \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot (1 - \epsilon/\theta + \epsilon^2/\theta^2 + \cdots ...) .$$

As ϵ is nilpotent, so is ϵ/θ and the result follows for $a = 1/T$. Continuity now finishes the proof for all $x \in \mathbf{K}$. $\square$

Suppose now that ϵ satisfies the minimal polynomial $u^t = 0$ and let ${}_1C_\infty := C_\infty[\epsilon]$ be the t-th order infinitesimal thickening of C_∞. Let $x \in \mathbf{K}$. By the proposition, we can represent $E_{x,*}$ as an element of ${}_1C_\infty$; we will denote the nilpotent part of $E_{x,*}$ by ϵ_x. Let $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbf{K}^{\text{sep}}$ and let λ satisfy the separable polynomial equation $f(u) = \sum_{i=0}^{e} a_i u^i = 0$ with

K-coefficients and $a_0 \neq 0$. If we can find an extension of the injection $x \mapsto E_{x,*}$ to λ, then clearly $E_{\lambda,*} = \overline{\lambda} + \epsilon_\lambda = \overline{\lambda} + \epsilon_\lambda$ satisfies the equation *with coefficients in* ${}_1C_\infty$

$$f_1(u) := \sum_{i=0}^{e} E_{a_i,*}u^i = \sum_{i=0}^{e}(\overline{a_i} + \epsilon_{a_i})u^i = 0\,. \tag{3}$$

Let $f_2(u) := \sum_{i=1}^{e}(\overline{a_i} + \epsilon_{a_i})u^i + \overline{a_0}$; so that now $f_2(\overline{\lambda} + \epsilon_\lambda)$ equals $-\epsilon_{a_0}$ and is nilpotent. Set $f_3(u) := f_2(\overline{\lambda} + u)$; thus we deduce that

$$f_3(\epsilon_\lambda) = -\epsilon_{a_0}\,, \tag{4}$$

and that f_3 takes the origin to the origin in $\mathrm{Spec}({}_1C_\infty[u])$. Note that $f_3'(0) \equiv \overline{f'(\lambda)} \pmod{(\epsilon)}$. As $f'(\lambda) \neq 0$, $f_3(u)$ is also étale at the origin.

Proposition 10. *There exits a unique solution* $\epsilon_\lambda \in {}_1C_\infty$ *to* Equation 4.

Proof. Since the map $f_3(u)$ is étale, there is a formal inverse to it. As we are dealing with nilpotents, we may evaluate it at $-\epsilon_{a_0}$ to find ϵ_λ and to see that it lies in $C_\infty[\epsilon]$. □

Theorem 2 is now easily seen. Indeed, Proposition 10 certainly gives the extension to $\mathbf{K}(\lambda)$ and the uniqueness implies that we can actually piece together these liftings all the way up to $\mathbf{K}^{\mathrm{sep}}$.

Remarks 8. The argument in Proposition 10 shows that the only possible lifting of $E_{x,*}$ to the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}_r$ must be as scalars; i.e., the nilpotent part vanishes.

Example 6. We put ourselves back in the situation of $E = C^{\otimes 2}$ as in Example 5. Set $r = 5$. We will show how our method can be used to lift the definition of $C_x^{\otimes 2}$ to λ satisfying the **K**-equation in u

$$u^2 + Tu + T^3 = 0\,. \tag{5}$$

It is easy to see that this equation is irreducible and separable over **K**. We will use the notation just given above; so $C_{T,*}^{\otimes 2} = \theta + \epsilon$ and $\epsilon^2 = 0$. Thus $C_{\lambda,*}^{\otimes 2} = \overline{\lambda} + \epsilon_\lambda$ where ϵ_λ needs to be found. Using Equation 5 we see that

$$(\overline{\lambda} + \epsilon_\lambda)^2 + (\theta + \epsilon)(\overline{\lambda} + \epsilon_\lambda) + \theta^3 + 3\theta^2\epsilon = 0\,,$$

or

$$\epsilon_\lambda^2 + (2\overline{\lambda} + \theta + \epsilon)5\epsilon_\lambda + (\overline{\lambda}^2 + \theta\overline{\lambda} + \theta^3) + (\overline{\lambda} + 3\theta^2)\epsilon = 0\,.$$

As $\overline{\lambda}^2 + \theta\overline{\lambda} + \theta^3 = 0$, we see that

$$\epsilon_\lambda^2 + (2\overline{\lambda} + \theta + \epsilon)\epsilon_\lambda = -(\overline{\lambda} + 3\theta^2)\epsilon\,.$$

As $\epsilon^2 = 0$, one easily solves to see that

$$\epsilon_\lambda = \frac{-(\overline{\lambda} + 3\theta^2)\epsilon}{2\overline{\lambda} + \theta + \epsilon} = \left(\frac{-\overline{\lambda} - 3\theta^2}{2\overline{\lambda} + \theta}\right)\epsilon\,.$$

We now give another approach to Theorem 2 through the use of differential calculus in characteristic p. To see how this can be accomplished we continue to examine the second tensor power of the Carlitz module.

Example 7. (Example 6 redux.) It is easy to see that for $a \in \mathbf{A}$ one has

$$E_{a,*} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{a} & \overline{a'} \\ 0 & \overline{a} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}$$

where $\overline{a} = \theta(a)$, $\overline{a'} = \overline{\dfrac{da}{dT}} = \dfrac{d\overline{a}}{d\theta}$ etc. It is elementary to see that injection $a \mapsto E_a$ extends to $a \in \mathbf{K}$ in *exactly* the same form. Now, as is very well-known, the derivation $x \mapsto \frac{dx}{dT}$ on $\mathbf{A}$ has a unique extension to $\mathbf{K}^{\mathrm{sep}}$. Thus this extended derivation in turn furnishes the desired extension of $C_{x,*}^{\otimes 2}$ to all separable elements and, in particular, λ of Example 6. In fact, to find $\theta(\frac{d\lambda}{dT}) := \frac{d\overline{\lambda}}{d\theta}$ one first differentiates implicitly Equation 5 to find

$$(2\lambda + T)\frac{d\lambda}{dT} + (\lambda + 3T^2) = 0$$

and then applies θ after solving for $\frac{d\lambda}{dT}$. The answer is now easily seen to agree with that of Example 6.

The above example can be extended greatly. Let n and j be nonnegative integers and let $\binom{n}{j}$ be the usual binomial coefficient. Let $\mathfrak{D}_j$ be the differential operator on $\mathbf{A}$ which has

$$\mathfrak{D}_j T^n = \binom{n}{j} T^{n-j} .$$

(N.B.: in characteristic 0, and *only* characteristic 0, one has $\mathfrak{D}_j = \frac{\mathfrak{D}_1^j}{j!}$.) The operators $\{\mathfrak{D}_j\}$ are called "hyperderivatives" (or "higher derivatives") and form the basis of characteristic p calculus. They arose first in the paper of Hasse and Schmidt [HS1]. It is simple to see that the collection $\{\mathfrak{D}_j\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies the "Leibniz identity:"

$$\mathfrak{D}_n(uv) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \mathfrak{D}_i(u)\mathfrak{D}_{n-i}(v) .$$

If now ϵ is a nilpotent with $\epsilon^n = 0$, then, as is well known, the Leibniz formula implies that the map from $\mathbf{A}$ to $\mathbf{A}[\epsilon]$ given by

$$a \mapsto \sum_{i=0}^{n} \mathfrak{D}_i(a)\epsilon^i$$

is a homomorphism.

Let E now be an arbitrary T-module of dimension t over a finite extension K_1 of K. As above let $\epsilon := N_T$. As the elements of K_1 are *scalars*, the next result follows immediately.

Proposition 11. *Let $a \in \mathbf{A}$. Then*

$$E_{a,*} = \overline{\left(\sum_{i=0}^{t} \mathfrak{D}_i(a)\epsilon^i \right)} \in A[\epsilon] .$$

Thus we see that Theorem 2 immediately implies the liftability of hyperderivatives to arbitrary separable extensions of $\mathbf{K}$; in fact the techniques of Proposition 10 can be also used to show this well-known fact (see, e.g., [IKN]) in complete generality. Conversely, Theorem 2 follows directly once we know the liftability of such operators.

The results of Sections 2 and 4 now imply the following basic question. Let $L(M,s)$ be an L-function of arithmetic interest associated to a motive M defined over a finite extension L of k. Recall that, as in Remarks 2, $L(M\otimes C^{\otimes n},s)=L(M,s-n)$. Let $\rho: L\to \overline{K}$ be an embedding. Thus via ρ we obtain a motive M^ρ defined over a finite extension of K which we may assume is uniformizable (e.g., if M is any tensor product of Drinfeld modules). We can therefore speak about multi-valued operators on M^ρ.

Question 3. Is it possible to canonically describe the fields $C(L,y)$, $Z(L,y)$ etc. as subalgebras of the algebra of multi-valued operators on M^ρ and $M^\rho\otimes C^{\otimes n}$?

For instance, let ψ be a Drinfeld module defined over $k=\mathbb{F}_r(\theta)$. Obviously, there is only one embedding into $\overline{K}$. One can then look for descriptions of the maximal separable (over $\mathbf{K}$) subfields of the zero fields of $L(\psi,s)$ in terms of multi-valued operators on ψ *and* the motives $\psi\otimes C^{\otimes n}$ where $n\geq 1$.

As in Remarks 6 we can refine the above statements when the motive has complex multiplication. Before giving this refinement there is a subtlety that must first be discussed. Let E be a motive with complex multiplication by a field $\mathbf{F}$ considered as a subfield of $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$. As in Remarks 6, we require that if $f\in\mathbf{F}$ then then tangent action, $E_{f,*}$, is of the familiar form $E_{f,*}=\overline{f}+N_f$ where N_f is nilpotent. The subtlety is that we will need the same statement to be true of the canonical action of $\mathbf{F}$ on all tensor powers $E\otimes C^{\otimes n}$. Our next example will show the reader just how easily this may be established.

Example 8. Let $r=3$ and $\mathbf{A}_1$, ψ etc., be as in Example 4. We set $\mathbf{F}=\mathbf{k}(\lambda)$ where $\lambda^2=-T$; so $\mathbf{F}$ is just the quotient field of $\mathbf{A}_1$. We consider $\mathbf{F}$ as embedded in $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$. The T-module $\psi\otimes C$ is constructed as in Section 5.7 of [Go1]. That is, we first pass to the perfection $F_1:=F^{\text{perf}}$ of the field $F=k(\overline{\lambda})$. Next we let M_ψ and M_C be the T-modules associated to ψ and C. By definition both of these are modules over the ring $F_1[T]$. Then $\psi\otimes C$ is the T-module associated to the module $M_1:=M_\psi\otimes_{F_1[T]}M_C$ equipped with the *diagonal* action of τ (= the r-th power mapping). That is

$$\tau(a\otimes b):=\tau(a)\otimes\tau(b)\,.$$

The tangent space of $\psi\otimes C$ is dual to $M_1/\tau M_1$ (Lemma 5.4.7 of [Go1]), and so we are reduced to examining the action of an element $f\in\mathbf{F}$ on the isogeny class of $M_1/\tau M_1$. Now without loss of generality we can assume that f gives rise to an actual action on M_1 itself. Note that $T-\theta$ kills both $M_\psi/\tau M_\psi$ and $M_C/\tau M_C$ (as these arise from Drinfeld modules which are 1-dimensional), and so

$$(T-\theta)^2M_1/\tau M_1=\{0\}\,.$$

Now $\lambda^2+T=0$, which implies

$$(x-\lambda)(x+\lambda)=x^2+T\,.$$

Thus

$$(\overline{\lambda}-\lambda)(\overline{\lambda}+\lambda)=T-\theta\,.$$

Consequently, by what we just saw, $(\overline{\lambda}-\lambda)^2(\overline{\lambda}+\lambda)^2$ kills $M_1/\tau M_1$. But the tangent action of $\lambda+\overline{\lambda}$ is clearly invertible and this implies that $(\lambda-\overline{\lambda})^2$ kills $M_1/\tau M_1$ as required.

We can now turn to the version of Question 3 appropriate for the case of complex multiplication. Suppose we have a motive M with complex multiplication as in Remarks 6. Let $\mathbf{F}$ be the complex multiplication field and $\mathbf{K}_1=\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{K}$ as before. As the tangent action of elements of $\mathbf{F}$ is assumed to have the same form as the tangent action of T (i.e., "scalar multiplication + nilpotent"), it is immediate that the tangent action continues to elements of $\mathbf{K}_1$. Then the above arguments immediately show that it also extends to the separable closure $\mathbf{K}_1^{\mathrm{sep}}$ of $\mathbf{K}_1$ inside $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$. Moreover we have also seen that $L(M,s)$ has coefficients in $\mathbf{K}_1$.

Question 4. Is it possible to canonically describe the maximal separable (over $\mathbf{K}_1$) subfields of the zero fields of $L(M,s)$ as multi-valued operators on M and $M \otimes C^{\otimes n}$ etc.?

5. The v-adic and global theory

In this last section we will briefly discuss the v-adic and global versions of the above results. Let $v \in \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$ be fixed and let $\mathbf{k}_v$ be the completion of $\mathbf{k}$ at v. Let $\overline{\mathbf{k}_v}$ be a fixed algebraic closure of $\mathbf{k}_v$ equipped with its canonical metric. Let $\mathbf{C}_v$ be the completion of $\overline{\mathbf{k}_v}$.

As in Section 2, for an ideal $\mathfrak{I}$ of $\mathbf{A}$ one has the element $\mathfrak{I}^{s_1} \in \overline{\mathbf{k}} \subset \mathbf{C}_\infty$. The collection of all such elements generates an extension $\mathbf{V}$ of $\mathbf{k}$ which can easily be shown to be finite (Prop. 8.2.9 of [Go1]). Let $\sigma\colon \mathbf{V} \to \overline{\mathbf{k}_v}$ be an embedding over $\mathbf{k}$ and let $\mathbf{k}_{\sigma,v}$ be the compositum of $\sigma(\mathbf{V})$ and $\mathbf{k}_v$. This extension is finite over $\mathbf{k}_v$ and has $\mathbf{A}_v$-integers $\mathbf{A}_{\sigma,v}$. Let d_v be the degree of v over $\mathbb{F}_r$, and let f_σ be the residue degree of $\mathbf{A}_{\sigma,v}$ over $\mathbf{A}_v$.

Definition 9. We set

$$S_{\sigma,v} := \varprojlim_{j} \mathbb{Z}/(p^j(p^{d_v f_\sigma}-1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}/(r^{d_v f_\sigma}-1)\,.$$

Note that $S_{\sigma,v}$ is obviously a ring.

Let $\beta \in \mathbf{A}_{\sigma,v}^*$. Then, as is completely standard, β has a canonical decomposition

$$\beta = \omega_{\sigma,v}(\beta)\langle\beta\rangle_{\sigma,v}$$

where $\langle\beta\rangle_{\sigma,v}$ is a 1-unit and $\omega_{\sigma,v}$ is the Teichmüller representative. Let $s_v = (s_{v,0}, s_{v,1}) \in S_{\sigma,v}$, where s_v is not to be confused with $s_j \in S_\infty$. We then set

$$\beta^{s_v} := \omega_{\sigma,v}(\beta)^{s_{v,1}}\langle\beta\rangle_{\sigma,v}^{s_{v,0}}\,.$$

Now let $\mathfrak{I}$ be any ideal of $\mathbf{A}$ which is prime to v. By definition, if o is the order of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{P}^+$ then $\mathfrak{I}^o = (i)$ where i is positive and prime to v. Thus $(\mathfrak{I}^{s_1})^o = i$ which implies that $\mathfrak{I}^{s_1}$ is also prime to v. Our next definition is then the v-adic version of Definition 2.

Definition 10. Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be as above and let $e_v := (x_v, s_v) \in \mathbf{C}_v^* \times S_{\sigma,v}$. Then we set

$$\mathfrak{I}^{e_v} := \mathfrak{I}^{(x_v,s_v)} := x_v^{\deg \mathfrak{I}}\sigma(\mathfrak{I}^{s_1})^{s_v}\,.$$

It is now a very simple matter to use Definition 10 to define the *v-adic L-functions* of a motive M as an Euler product over primes *not* dividing v — this L-function is denoted $L_{\sigma,v}(M, e_v)$ etc. For the details we refer the reader to [Go1], Definition 8.6.8. One can also define the zero fields of $L_{\sigma,v}(M,e_v)$ exactly as in Definition 3. This field will depend on the original motive M, $v \in \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$, the sign function sgn, the root of unity ζ of Proposition 3, and $s_v \in S_v$.

Example 9. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{F}_r[T]$, $A = \mathbb{F}_r[\theta]$ and

$$\zeta_A(s) = \sum_{n \text{ monic}} n^{-s} = \prod_{f \text{ monic prime}} (1 - f^{-s})^{-1}\,,$$

as in Example 1. Note that as $\mathbf{A}$ has class number 1, one immediately deduces that $\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{k}$; we will thus drop any reference to the obviously canonical embedding $\sigma\colon \mathbf{k}\to\mathbf{k}_v$ for fixed $v\in\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$. In terms of Euler products, by definition we have

$$\zeta_{A,v}(e_v)=\prod_{\substack{f \text{ monic prime}\\ f\not\equiv 0 \bmod v}}(1-f^{-e_v})^{-1}$$

etc. This Euler product converges for those e_v with $|x_v|_v>1$. Upon expanding out the product, we have

$$\zeta_{A,v}(e_v)=\sum_{\substack{n \text{ monic}\\ n\not\equiv 0 \bmod v}} n^{-e_v}=\sum_{\substack{n \text{ monic}\\ n\not\equiv 0 \bmod v}} x_v^{-\deg n}n^{-s_v}\,.$$

By grouping together according to degree, we see

$$\zeta_{A,v}(e_v)=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}x_v^{-j}\left(\sum_{\substack{n \text{ monic}\\ \deg n=j\\ n\not\equiv 0 \bmod v}} n^{-s_v}\right)\,.$$

Basic estimates (Lemma 8.8.1 of [Go1]) imply that for fixed $s_v\in S_v$, $\zeta_{A,v}(x_v,s_v)$ converges to an entire v-adic power series in x_v^{-1} such that the zeroes "flow continuously" in s_v.

There is another way to obtain these v-adic functions via "essential algebraicity." For our purposes here, we will illustrate this by continuing to discuss $\zeta_{A,v}(e_v)$ where $A=\mathbb{F}_r[\theta]$; in general, we refer the reader to Sections 8.5 and 8.12 of [Go1].

Example 10. We continue here with the set-up of Example 9. Let π be our fixed positive uniformizer. We set $z_\zeta(x,0)\equiv 1$, and for j a positive integer,

$$z_\zeta(x,-j):=\zeta_A(x\pi^j,-j)=\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}x^{-i}\left(\sum_{\substack{n \text{ monic}\\ \deg n=i}} n^j\right)\,.$$

As $\zeta_A(s)$ is an entire function on S_∞, the power series $z_\zeta(x,-j)$ is entire in x^{-1}. But as the coefficients are in $\mathbf{A}$, one sees immediately that this forces $z_\zeta(x,-j)$ to be a *polynomial* in x^{-1}. Moreover, if j is positive and divisible by $r-1$, then there is the *trivial zero*

$$\zeta_A(-j)=\zeta_A(s_{-j})=z_\zeta(1,-j)=0\,.$$

Thus we set $\tilde{z}_\zeta(x,-j)=z_\zeta(x,-j)$ if $j\not\equiv 0 \bmod (r-1)$, and $\tilde{z}_\zeta(x,-j)=z_\zeta(x,-j)/(1-x^{-1})$ for those positive $j\equiv 0 \bmod (r-1)$.

The polynomials $\{z_\zeta(x,-j)\}$ and $\{\tilde{z}_\zeta(x,-j)\}$, are obviously *global objects* as they have coefficients in $\mathbf{A}$. Their importance is precisely the following. Let $v\in\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$ and substitute x_v for x. Then the polynomials $\{z_\zeta(x_v,-j)\}$ *interpolate v-adically to the entire functions $\zeta_{A,v}(e_v)$*. Thus, much information about these v-adic functions can be obtained from $\zeta_\zeta(x,-j)$. Note also that the process of interpolation removes the Euler factor at v from $z_\zeta(x_v,-j)$.

It is certainly very reasonable to inquire about a possible v-adic version of the Riemann hypothesis of [W1], [DV1] and [Sh1]. Our first result along these lines is contained in a clever observation of D. Wan that *some* v-adic information can actually be gleaned from results already established at ∞. This is contained in the next result.

Proposition 12. *Let v be prime of degree 1 in $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{F}_r[T]$. Let j be an element of the ideal $(r-1)S_v$. Then the zeroes (in x_v) of $\zeta_{A,v}(x_v, j)$ are simple and in $\mathbf{k}_v$.*

Proof. The idea of the proof is to exploit the isomorphism between $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{k}_\infty$ and $\mathbf{k}_v$ (remember $\deg v = 1!$). Without loss of generality, we can set $v = (T)$. Furthermore, we begin by letting j be a positive integer divisible by $r-1$ and we *choose* our positive uniformizer to be $\pi = 1/T$. Now the coefficient of x^{-d} in $\zeta_A(x, -j)$ is precisely the sum of $\langle n\rangle^j$ where $\deg n = j$ and n is monic, while the coefficient of x_v^{-d} in $\zeta_{A,v}(x_v, -j)$ is the sum of n^j such that n is monic of degree d and $n \not\equiv 0 \bmod v$. This last condition is the same as saying that n has non-vanishing constant term.

The set $\{\langle n\rangle\}$, where n is monic, ranges over all polynomials $f(1/T)$ in $1/T$ with constant term 1 and degree (in $1/T$) $< d$. Moreover, as j is divisible by $r-1$, the set $\{\langle n\rangle^j\}$ is the same as the set $f(1/T)^j$ where $f(u)$ is a monic polynomial of degree $< d$ and has *non-vanishing* constant term.

Let us denote by $\zeta_{A,v}(x, -j)$ the function obtained by replacing x_v by x in $\zeta_{A,v}(x_v, -j)$ and applying the isomorphism $\mathbf{k}_v \to \mathbf{k}_\infty$ given by $T \mapsto 1/T$. The above now implies that

$$(1 - x^{-1})^{-1}\zeta_{A,v}(x, -j) = \zeta_A(x, -j)\,.$$

The result for positive j divisible by $r-1$ follows immediately when we recall that $\zeta_{A,v}(e_v)$ has an Euler product over all primes *not* equal to v. The general result then follows simply by passing to the limit. ☐

Remarks 9. Proposition 12 seems to indicate that there may also be a Riemann hypothesis type phenomenon for the finite primes of $\mathbf{A}$. But the situation is definitely more subtle than the proposition indicates. Indeed, the work of Wan, Diaz-Vargas and Sheats establishes that the polynomials $z_\zeta(x, -j)$ of Example 10 are *separable.* Now if Proposition 12 was true for all j and *all* finite v, then these polynomials would have to split totally in $\mathbf{k}$. However, recent computer work by J. Roberts seems to indicate that the polynomials $\tilde{z}_\zeta(x, -j)$ are *irreducible.* Indeed, in the examples computed, Eisenstein's irreducibility criterion works. Therefore, if there is a v-adic Riemann hypothesis in general, one should expect non-trivial finite (at least) extensions to be involved. As always, a complete theory would predict these extensions etc.

Question 5. Are the polynomials $\tilde{z}_\zeta(x, -j)$ irreducible in general?

Remarks 10. Using standard results in algebra, the Galois groups of some of the polynomials $\tilde{z}_\zeta(x, -j)$ have been computed where

$$\deg_{x^{-1}}(\tilde{z}_\zeta(x, -j)) \leq 4\,.$$

These have all turned out to be the *full symmetric group* and so, in particular, are non-abelian in general. Even for small r and j, the polynomials in T that appear as coefficients are quite large and a great deal of computer time was necessary. For instance, for $r = 5$ and $j = 1249$, the degree in x^{-1} of $z_\zeta(x, -j)$ is 4. The constant term is 1, of course, the coefficient of x^{-1} has degree 1245 in T, the coefficient of x^{-2} has degree 2470, the coefficient of x^{-3} has degree 3595, and the coefficient of x^{-4} has degree 4220. The resolvent cubic was shown to be irreducible modulo the sixth degree prime $T^6+T^5+T^4+T^3+T^2+T+1$ by brute force. The discriminant of this cubic was computed and seen not to be a square thereby giving the result.

Question 6. Is the Galois group of $\tilde{z}_\zeta(x,-j)$ the full symmetric group in general?

Let $\mathbf{k}(j)\subset \mathbf{C}_\infty$ be the splitting field of $\tilde{z}_\zeta(x,-j)$. As $\deg\infty=1$, it is easy to see that this field does not depend upon the choice of sign function and only depends on j, etc. One would like to also know what are the primes, besides ∞ (and perhaps those of degree 1), that split completely in $\mathbf{k}(j)$ as well as the discriminant (to $\mathbf{k}$) etc.

Finally, let us define $\mathbf{k}_\zeta$ to be the compositum of all such $\mathbf{k}(j)$. Again, $\mathbf{k}_\zeta$ will be Galois over $\mathbf{k}$ and the prime at ∞ will split completely.

Question 7. Is there a canonical description of $\mathbf{k}_\zeta$ (perhaps as multi-valued operators etc.) as a subfield of the maximal totally split at ∞ subfield of $\mathbf{k}^{\text{sep}}$?

Next we examine the v-adic theory of multi-valued operators. Let E be a motive defined over a finite extension of k_v. One still has an exponential $\exp_v$ and logarithm $\log_v$ associated to E. However, it is important to note that one cannot expect that $\exp_v$ is surjective. In fact, like the usual exponential function p-adically, the exponential of the Carlitz module can easily be seen to have a finite v-adic radius of convergence. Still, there is still an obvious notion of "v-adic multi-valued operator" on M based on Definition 8 which we leave to the reader.

To establish the v-adic analog of Theorem 2 we first must discuss some results in the theory of hyper-derivatives. Let n be a positive integers and let $1\le j\le n$. Let $\mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ be the set of non-negative integers and let $P(n,j)$ be the set of those n-tuples $(\mu_1,\dots,\mu_n)\in(\mathbb{Z}_{\ge0})^n$ such that $\sum_i\mu_i=j$ and $\sum_i i\mu_i=n$. For each $\mu\in P(n,j)$ one defines an operator on $\mathbf{A}$ by

$$\mathfrak{D}_\mu(f):=\mathfrak{D}_{\mu_1}(f)^{\mu_1}\cdots\mathfrak{D}_{\mu_n}(f)^{\mu_n}\,,$$

and, for $m\ge 0$, a multinomial coefficient

$$M^j_\mu(m):=\frac{m!}{\mu_1!\cdots\mu_n!(m-j)!}=\frac{m(m-1)\cdots(m-j+1)}{\mu_1!\cdots\mu_n!}\,.$$

We then have the following well-known result (see e.g., [KY1], [US1]) which follows by induction.

Lemma 2. *Let $f\in\mathbf{A}$ and $m\ge1$. Then*

$$\mathfrak{D}_n(f^m)=\sum_{j=1}^n f^{m-j}\left(\sum_{\mu\in P(n,j)}M^j_\mu(m)\mathfrak{D}_\mu(f)\right)\,.$$

Proposition 13. *Let $v\in\operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$. Then the hyper-differential operators are v-adically continuous.*

Proof. Let $n\ge0$ and let $\mathfrak{D}_n$ be one such differential operator. Let $v=(f)$ and let $g\in\mathbf{A}$ be v-adically small, say $g=cf^m$. We need to establish that $\mathfrak{D}_n(g)$ is also v-adically small. But Lemma 2 and the Leibniz formula easily show that $\mathfrak{D}_n(g)\equiv 0 \pmod{f^{m-n}}$. $\square$

Proposition 13 immediately implies that the tangent action, $\alpha \mapsto E_{\alpha,*}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbf{A}$, continues v-adically to $\alpha \in \mathbf{A}_v$. Inverting a non-zero non-unit element as in Proposition 9 then extends this continuously to all $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}_v$. Recall that θ gives an isomorphism between $\mathbf{k}_v$ and k_v where the prime v is identified with its isomorphic image. Thus the next result follows via the same arguments as in Proposition 10.

Theorem 3. *The T-action of E can be uniquely extended to an injection of $\mathbb{F}_r$-algebras, $x \mapsto E_x$, of the separable closure $\mathbf{k}_v^{\text{sep}}$ of $\mathbf{k}_v$ into the algebra of multi-valued operators. Moreover, if $E_{x,*}$ is the induced action on the tangent space of the origin, then $E_{x,*} = \theta(x)\cdot\mathbf{1}+N_x = \overline{x}+N_x$ where N_x is nilpotent.*

We leave the appropriate version of Theorem 3 in the case of complex multiplication to the reader. Similarly, Theorem 3 leads to obvious v-adic versions of Questions 3 and 4.

Theorem 3 also raises some interesting questions about the nature of multi-valued operators. We will pose these in the simplest case of the tensor powers of the Carlitz module. Let $C^{\otimes n}$, $n \geq 1$ be the n-th tensor power of the Carlitz module viewed over k. By Proposition 13 we know that we may continuously extend $C_a^{\otimes n}$, $a \in \mathbf{A}$, to all $a \in \mathbf{A}_v$. By our construction via the exponential and logarithm, it is clear that all such $C_a^{\otimes n}$ belong to the formal algebra of formal power series $\sum a_i\tau^i$ where the a_i are $n \times n$ matrices with k_v-coefficients. On the other hand, we can write a as the limit of $a_i \in \mathbf{A}$ where all the coefficients of $C_{a_i}^{\otimes n}$ are matrices with coefficients in A. As such we immediately deduce that the coefficients of $C_a^{\otimes n}$ are matrices with A_v-valued coefficients for all $a \in \mathbf{A}_v$. (See e.g., the discussion at the beginning of Section 4 of [Go1] for the case of Drinfeld modules.) We can thus *reduce* these elements modulo v to get a formal $\mathbf{A}_v$-action associated to $C^{\otimes n}$ over the *finite* field A/v.

Now let F be a finite separable extension of $\mathbf{k}$ and let $\mathcal{O}$ be the $\mathbf{A}$-integers of F. Let w be an unramified prime of $\mathcal{O}$ of degree 1 over $v \in \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{A})$; so $\mathcal{O}_w \cong \mathbf{A}/v$. Thus by the argument just given there is a formal $\mathcal{O}$-action associated to $C^{\otimes n}$ over $\mathcal{O}/w \cong \mathbf{A}/v$ by simply reducing modulo w.

Question 8. Is it possible to reduce the formal $\mathcal{O}$-action at other primes?

In other words, what "denominators" are induced by the construction of multi-valued operators?

REFERENCES

[AK1] A. ALTMAN, S. KLEIMAN: *Introduction to Grothendieck Duality Theory,* Lect. Notes in Math. **146**, Springer (1970).

[A1] G. ANDERSON: t-motives, *Duke Math. J.* **53** (1986), 457-502.

[AT1] G. ANDERSON, D. THAKUR: Tensor powers of the Carlitz module and zeta values, *Ann. of Math.* **132** (1990), 159-191.

[DV1] J. DIAZ-VARGAS: Riemann hypothesis for $\mathbb{F}_p[T]$, *J. Number Theory* **59** (1996), 313–318.

[Go1] D. GOSS: *Basic Structures of Function Field Arithmetic*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[HS1] H. HASSE, F.K. SCHMIDT: Noch eine Begründung der Theorie der höheren Differentialquotienten in einem algebraischen Funktionenkörper einer Unbestimmten, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **177** (1937), 215-237.

[KY1] Y. KAWAHARA, Y. YOKOYAMA: On higher differentials in commutative rings, *TRU Math.* **2** (1966), 12-30.

[IKN] Y. ISHIBASHI, K. KOSAKI, Y. NAKAI: High order derivations, II, *J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ.* Ser. A-I **34** (1970), 17-27.

[P1] R. PINK: The Mumford-Tate conjecture for Drinfeld modules, (preprint).

[Sa1] T. Satoh: On duality over a certain divided power algebra with positive characteristic, *Manuscripta Math.* **92** (1997), 153-172.

[Sh1] J. Sheats: The Riemann hypothesis for the Goss zeta function for $\mathbb{F}_q[T]$ (preprint).

[Ta1] J. Tate: Number theoretic background, in: *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.*, **33** Amer. Math. Soc. (1979), 3-26.

[TW1] Y. Taguchi, D. Wan: Entireness of L-functions of φ-sheaves on affine complete intersections, *J. Number Theory* **63** (1997), 170-179.

[US1] Y. Uchino, T. Satoh: Function field modular forms and higher derivatives, (preprint).

[W1] D. Wan: On the Riemann hypothesis for the characteristic p zeta function, *J. Number Theory* **58** (1996), 196-212.

Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, 231 W. 18th Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43210

E-mail address: `goss@math.ohio-state.edu`